

**Report of the Revisit to  
National Hispanic University  
May 2011**

**Overview of this Report**

This item is the report on the revisit to National Hispanic University that was conducted on April 18-20, 2011. The original visit took place February 7-10, 2010. The report includes the re-visit team findings as well as recommendations regarding the five stipulations and the accreditation status.

**Revisit Team Recommendations**

1. That one Stipulation from the 2010 accreditation visit be amended and four Stipulations be removed.
2. That the accreditation decision for National Hispanic University be changed from **Accreditation with Major Stipulations** to **Accreditation with Stipulations**

**Background**

Following the February 7-10, 2010 accreditation visit to National Hispanic University the accreditation team recommended that the COA grant **Accreditation with Major Stipulations** to National Hispanic University (NHU) and all of its credential programs. The COA accepted the team's accreditation recommendation and required that the institution prepare for a focused revisit within one year of the date of the COA action. NHU was required to respond to the stipulations and address all standards that were found to be less than fully met during the initial February 2010 visit. Following is a table of the 2010 Stipulations that were approved by the COA.

| <b>2010 Stipulations</b>   | <b>Revisit Team Recommendations</b> |
|--|-------------------------------------|
| 1. The university must assure that every intern is supervised by a university supervisor during the entire internship.   | This Stipulation be amended         |
| 2. There must be the establishment of collaborative partnerships with major stakeholders actively involved in the organization, coordination, and governance of all professional preparation programs. | Removal of Stipulation              |
| 3. The university must create a unit assessment plan that is articulated with the different program assessment processes to inform systematic program improvement and resource allocation.             | Removal of Stipulation              |
| 4. The university must develop and implement a uniform system of professional development of field supervisors and master teachers that is based on regular and systematic evaluation.                 | Removal of Stipulation              |
| 5. The revisit must provide updated information on all standards that are less than fully met.   | Removal of Stipulation              |

**Standards Less than Fully Met at the 2010 Visit and the Revisit Team Findings**

| <b>Common Standards</b>                       | <b>2010 Findings</b> | <b>2011 Findings</b> |
|---|----------------------|----------------------|
| 2. Unit and Program Assessment and Evaluation | Met with Concerns    | Met                  |
| 3. Resources                                  | Met with Concerns    | Met                  |
| 4. Faculty and Instructional Personnel        | Met with Concerns    | Met                  |
| 7. Field Experience and Clinical Practice     | Met with Concerns    | Met                  |
| 8. District-Employed Supervisors              | Met with Concerns    | Met                  |

| <b>Multiple Subject and Single Subject Credential Programs, with Internship and BCLAD Emphasis</b>      | <b>2010 Findings</b> | <b>2011 Findings</b> |
|---|----------------------|----------------------|
| 1. Program Design   | Met with Concerns    | Met with Concerns    |
| 2. Collaboration in Governing the Program   | Met with Concerns    | Met                  |
| 8-B. Pedagogical Preparation for Subject-Specific Content Instruction by Single Subject (SS) Candidates | Met with Concerns    | Met                  |
| <b>Level I Mild to Moderate Education Specialist Credential Program, with Internship</b>                |                      |                      |
| 11. Educational Policy and Perspectives   | Met with Concerns    | Met                  |
| 13. Special Education Field Experiences with Diverse Populations  | Met with Concerns    | Met with Concerns    |
| 14. Qualifications and Responsibilities of Supervisors and Selection of Field Sites                     | Met with Concerns    | Met with Concerns    |
| 17. Assessment, Curriculum, and Instruction   | Met with Concerns    | Met                  |
| 22. Assessment and Evaluation of Students   | Met with Concerns    | Met                  |
| 25. Characteristics of Individuals with Mild to Moderate Disabilities                                   | Met with Concerns    | Met                  |

On April 15, 2010, the educational assets of The National Hispanic University were acquired by a newly formed Laureate affiliate, National Hispanic University, LLC. National Hispanic University, LLC, has been capitalized with an initial Laureate contribution of \$4.4 million. With Laureate's assistance, the institution worked to plan and implement changes to address the deficiencies that were outlined in the April 2010 COA accreditation report. The institution prepared an interview schedule with the constituencies identified by the team, presented evidentiary material and hosted an accreditation revisit from April 18-20, 2011. The revisit was conducted by a team leader and one team member. Following accreditation activities, a draft accreditation report was presented to the institution. That report is now presented to the COA for consideration and action.

**Commission on Teacher Credentialing  
Committee on Accreditation  
Accreditation Team Revisit Report  
April 2011**

**Institution:** National Hispanic University

**Dates of Revisit:** April 18-20, 2011

**Revisit Team**

**Recommendation:** Accreditation with Stipulations

**Revisit Team Recommendations**

1. That one Stipulation from the 2010 accreditation visit be amended and four Stipulations be removed.
2. That the accreditation decision for National Hispanic University be changed from *Accreditation with Major Stipulations* to *Accreditation with Stipulations*

**Rationale:**

The unanimous recommendation of **Accreditation with Stipulations** was based on a thorough review of the institutional response to the stipulations and standards that were met with concerns; additional supporting documents available during the visit; interviews with administrators, faculty, candidates, program completers, and local school personnel; along with additional information requested from program leadership during the visit. The team found and recommends that one stipulation be amended and the remaining four stipulations be removed and that all Common Standards are now Met and that all program standards are Met with the exception of three that remain Met with Concerns:

| Program Standards   |   |
|---|---|
| Multiple Subject and Single Subject Credential Programs, with Internship and BCLAD<br>Emphasis: | 1. Program Design   |
| Level I Mild to Moderate Education Specialist Credential Program, with Internship:              | 13. Special Education Field Experiences with Diverse Populations<br>14. Qualifications and Responsibilities of Supervisors and Selection of Field Sites |

### Documents Reviewed

|  |  |
|--|--|
| Institutional Response                           | Course Sequence  |
| Student Teaching Data                            | Schedule of Classes  |
| Course Syllabi                                   | Advisement Documents   |
| Candidate Files                                  | Advisory Committee Minutes                                       |
| Program Information Booklets                     | Evaluations of master teachers and supervisors                   |
| Intern Handbook                                  | Intern Support and Supervision Processes                         |
| Orientations and Staff Development               | Faculty Vitae  |
| Trainings  | Follow-up Survey Results   |
| Contact Logs for Master Teachers and Supervisors | Sample Supervisor and Master Teacher Evaluation and Survey Tools |

### Interviews Conducted

|                                 |            |
|---------------------------------|------------|
| Candidates                      | 54         |
| Completers                      | 7          |
| Employers                       | 7          |
| Institutional Administration    | 8          |
| Program Coordinators            | 3          |
| Faculty                         | 12         |
| University Assessment Committee | 4          |
| Advisors                        | 3          |
| Field Supervisors – Program     | 8          |
| Field Supervisors - District    | 4          |
| Credential Analyst              | 1          |
| Advisory Board Members          | 5          |
| <b>Totals</b>                   | <b>111</b> |

*Note: In some cases, individuals were interviewed by more than one cluster (especially faculty) because of multiple roles. Thus, the number of interviews conducted exceeds the actual number of individuals interviewed.*

### Accreditation Revisit Team

**Team Leader:**

**Juan Flores**

California State University, Stanislaus

**Team Member:**

**Virginia Kennedy**

California State University, Northridge

**Staff:**

**Marilynn Fairgood**

Commission on Teacher Credentialing

## STIPULATIONS

The following section of this report includes the 2010 stipulations. The stipulations are followed by excerpts from the 2011 NHU institutional response to the stipulations, 2011 revisit team findings and revisit team recommendations.

### **2010 Stipulation #1**

**The university must assure that every intern is supervised by a university supervisor during the entire internship.**

### **2011 Institutional Response**

In May of 2010 NHU hired a full-time Practicum and Intern Coordinator to assist with intern coordination and to oversee the practicum events. The coordinator spent the first couple of months meeting with districts and principals to establish a relationship with practicum sites. The coordinator also worked to streamline and organize NHU practicum and intern processes.

Intern supervisors are required to provide assistance, weekly contact, and feedback to interns and continue to work with the intern teachers until the intern exits the program. NHU ensures the continued support of the interns throughout the year and throughout the internship by requiring monthly logs collected by the practicum and intern coordinator to verify service, surveys of interns twice a year to verify services and support, confirmation of on-going discussions with supervisors when logs are submitted and confirmation of discussions with interns at seminars. Continued intern support and other state-required tasks have been included in the NHU budget.

### **2011 Revisit Team Findings**

The institution has addressed the support issue throughout the program by providing university support providers; however, the support does not address the supervision requirement that is identified in this stipulation. The Multiple Subject, Single Subject and Education Specialist interns do not receive university supervision throughout their internship as required in the standards.

### **2011 Revisit Team Recommendation**

This Stipulation be amended to require the university to provide evidence that interns receive supervision throughout their internship as required in the program standards. This evidence must be provided no later than December 15, 2011 in the form of a report to Commission staff that identifies the intern, university supervisor, duration of supervision and evidence that supervision has been provided.

### **Stipulation #2**

**There must be the establishment of collaborative partnerships with major stakeholders actively involved in the organization, coordination, and governance of all professional preparation programs.**

### **2011 Institutional Response**

Following the 2010 COA meeting, NHU established the Teacher Education Advisory Committee to provide guidance on the implementation of teacher preparation programs. Education leaders from school districts, community education districts, the Santa Clara County Office of Education and NHU offer their expertise and experience to help the program improve in its mission. Advisory Committee meetings provide a forum for the review and exchange of information, suggestions and perspectives on a wide range of issues associated with the preparation of educators. Committee members make recommendations concerning NHU programs that lead to teacher certification and provide trends, data and feedback on the needs of the local districts. The Teacher Education Department (TED) chair convenes the Advisory Committee at least twice a year. The committee met in August 2010 and convenes again in April 2011.

The Provost and TED chair discuss recommendations from the Advisory Committee. Recommended curriculum changes must be approved by the faculty governing body and the University Curriculum and Academic Policy (UCAP) Committee. Personnel and Resources would need to be discussed and approved by the NHU administration and Laureate.

### **2011 Revisit Team Findings**

On the basis of review of program documents and interviews with the newly established Teacher Education Advisory Committee, there is evidence of systematic collaboration between program providers and school districts, higher education partners, and other constituents, and this joint collaboration is systematic and planned as envisioned by this standard. Review of the advisory committee meeting minutes indicates discussion of data and agreements on collaborative initiatives based on identified needs.

### **2011 Revisit Team Recommendation**

This systematic collaboration as verified by the minutes and documents produced by the Teacher Education Advisory Committee will result in program improvement initiatives based on identified needs. The team recommends the stipulation be removed.

### **Stipulation #3**

**The university must create a unit assessment plan that is articulated with the different program assessment processes to inform systematic program improvement and resource allocation.**

### **2011 Institutional Response**

Following the April 15, 2010 Laureate acquisition of National Hispanic University, the TED chair and the Provost met in April and May 2010 to discuss outlining a more systematic unit assessment system. Areas that were limited or missing were identified and a plan to address these areas was established in collaboration with the Office of Institutional Research (the established NHU assessment office) and with Laureate support services in May and June of 2010. Several needed changes were identified and implemented in late summer and fall of 2010 including development of formal student surveys, regular data collection timelines, creation of a Teacher Education Assessment Committee to advise and recommend changes, hiring additional

personnel to provide more resources and oversight, including a Practicum and Intern Coordinator and a Professional Development and TPA Coordinator.

The Teacher Education Department, in consultation with the University's Office of Institutional Research and Assessment and the Quality Assurance Committee developed a unit assessment plan that is articulated with the different program assessment processes to inform systematic program improvement and resource allocation. The plan follows the steps established by NHU's Quality Assurance Cycle to create a culture of evidence and to use data for decision-making. The Quality Assurance Cycle ensures that all data collected are analyzed, disseminated, and used for improvement or change planning. The nature of the cycle ensures a continuous analysis of information and decision-making.

The establishment of the University Curriculum and Academic Policy Committee (UCAP), approved by the NHU Board of Directors in February 2011, adds to the accountability system of the university. The UCAP committee includes three full-time faculty, three academic leaders and three contributing faculty members. The Department Chair serves as the academic lead for this team. The UCAP exercises general superintendence, review, and approval over the academic curriculum, policies, standards, rules, and regulations of the university, considers and approves any revisions to university and academic policies and admissions requirements, advises the Board of Directors as well as reviews curriculum assessment information and other relevant assessment information to ensure that the university is achieving its academic mission.

Laureate's initial \$4.4 million of capital allowed NHU to stabilize the institution financially, support needed enhancements, fulfill the commitment made to improve student and faculty experience, prepare for and support the university's growth by recruiting additional staff and faculty as required, enhance campus-based programs and develop new hybrid and online programs, and provide the infrastructure needed to support increased enrollments and technology innovations.

Laureate is committed to funding capital as needed over the next few years until NHU reaches a break-even position and beyond to ensure financial stability at NHU. This commitment extends to NHU's TED and its budget. For fiscal year 2011, this includes the support of two coordinators supplies, seminars and conferences and compensation for stipends and honoraria for master teachers and supervisors.

### **2011 Revisit Team Findings**

From the evidence gained from review of documentation and interviews, the team found that a systematic assessment system has been developed with multiple data points in order to make program decisions.

Assessment systems have been created to evaluate instructors, master teachers and university supervisors by the candidates. Systems have been further developed for evaluation of instructors, master teachers and university supervisors. Data is also collected on TPA results. Evidence of programmatic changes based upon the evaluative data was identified by team members.

### **2011 Revisit Team Recommendation**

The team found that NHU has made great progress in data collection and usage of the data to make program improvement decisions. The team recommends the stipulation be removed.

### **Stipulation #4**

**The university must develop and implement a uniform system of professional development of field supervisors and master teachers that is based on regular and systematic evaluation.**

### **2011 Institutional Response**

The practicum/intern coordinator and the professional development coordinator in collaboration with the TED chair were charged with the development of training sessions for the field supervisors. The supervisors and the coordinators felt that there was a need to have a training session once a semester. The first training date was conducted in July 2010 and was primarily based on identified needs from the supervisors, Teacher Performance Assessments, and informal student feedback. As the more formal survey system was fully implemented in September 2010 (first practicum completed with significant numbers) the second training in February 2011 included data from student evaluation feedback. Beginning in June 2011 the training schedule for field supervisors will be June, October and February thus allowing for one training each semester.

Master teacher training was designed and implemented in the September 2010. Training is individualized and conducted by the practicum and intern coordinator. The coordinator maintains a log of when training takes place. As more data are gathered the trainings will be revised to ensure the needs of the candidates and the needs of the supervisors and master teachers are met.

### **2011 Revisit Team Findings**

Evidence shows that the university has developed and begun to implement a systematic plan of professional development activities for university supervisors and master teachers. These activities are based on results gained from the assessment system.

### **2011 Revisit Team Recommendation**

The team recommends the stipulation be removed.

### **Stipulation #5**

**The revisit must provide updated information on all standards that are less than fully met.**

### **2011 Institutional Response**

The NHU revisit report that was submitted for the revisit team's review describes the actions taken by National Hispanic University to address the Stipulations and meet all Common Standards, Multiple Subject, Single Subject and Education Specialist Credential Program Standards that the 2010 accreditation team found to be Met with Concerns.

### **Revisit Team Findings**

The university provided updated information on all standards that were less than fully met. The revisit team found that the university has made significant progress in addressing the Stipulations and meeting all standards. The revisit team recommends that one Stipulation be amended and found that all Common Standards are now Met and three program standards remain Met with Concerns.

### **2011 Revisit Team Recommendation**

The team recommends the stipulation be removed.

### **Common Standards**

The 2010 accreditation team found that four of the nine Common Standards were Met with Concerns. This section of the report includes excerpts from the original 2010 team findings on the Common Standards, excerpts from the 2011 institutional response, the 2011 revisit team findings and revisit team recommendations.

### **2010 Team Findings: Standard 2: Unit and Program Assessment and Evaluation**

#### **Met with Concerns**

It is unclear at times whether there is a systematic plan for using the data collected from multiple assessments to make program decisions. Assessments for university supervisors, site support providers, and master teachers are informal, which may limit the ability for the unit to make informed decisions concerning employee effectiveness.

The unit collects data for candidate and program completers. It is often unclear as to how the unit analyzes and utilizes this data on candidate and program completers' performance. Greater emphasis needs to be given to create a system whereby data is collected systematically to drive program improvement.

It is often vague as to how assessment data is used for program improvement. The major assessment for making program decisions is the student evaluation of professors. Most of the other decisions are made informally. One example of recent change occurred when the TPAs became required. From this meeting faculty made changes in the syllabi to enable candidates to successfully complete the TPAs. Greater assessment data are needed to drive supervisory decision making.

### **2011 Institutional Response**

The Teacher Education Credential Program collects data and feedback throughout the year to inform program improvement and resource allocation. Every six weeks data are collected from student course evaluations, student surveys on master teachers and supervisors, and seminar reflections. TPAs are collected and scored every six weeks as well. Exit interviews are ongoing as students can graduate when they complete all requirements.

The TED chair receives all the data, analyzes the data in collaboration with the personnel who collect the data, and then reviews the data with the Teacher Education Assessment Committee. Changes are reviewed and if approved, the chair is charged with implementing the changes. The

TED uses the data to revise or update syllabi, enhance and plan course activities, plan training opportunities for faculty, and allocate resources where needed. Additionally, the NHU credential program has used both program reviews and CTC feedback to enhance the curriculum and ensure standard compliance.

### **2011 Revisit Team Findings**

From the evidence gained from review of documentation and interview, the team found that a systematic assessment system has been developed with multiple data points in order to make program decisions. At this point, this is a more formal assessment system which will enable the unit to make informed decisions regarding employee effectiveness.

The team found that a Teacher Education Assessment Committee has been established to systematically collect data and utilize it for program improvement. For example, data on candidate and program completers has been analyzed and used to increase success on the TPAs. Data gained from student evaluations of instructors has been used to make programmatic changes.

### **2011 Revisit Team Recommendation**

The team found that NHU has made great progress in data collection and usage of the data to make program improvement decisions. This standard is now **Met**.

### **2010 Team Findings: Standard 3: Resources**

### **Met with Concerns**

At times faculty and staff may be stretched by their responsibilities, but candidates speak highly of the quality of instruction and the preparation they receive so that they are able to successfully demonstrate State standards.

Greater emphasis needs to be given to professional development activities, particularly for field-based supervisors and university supervisors. Limited data is collected on the effectiveness of supervisors and master teachers, making it difficult to develop meaningful professional development experiences.

The Vice President of Finance indicated that next year the University will move to a departmental budget where the chair of the departments will be allotted a budget and given freedom to use the limited dollars. Professional development activities for master teachers and university supervisor need to be developed.

### **2011 Institution Response**

As a result of the April 15, 2010 acquisition by Laureate, greater resources and funds became available to the Teacher Education Department (TED). Funds were provided by the university with the full approval of Laureate to hire a TPA/professional development coordinator and a practicum/intern coordinator. In addition, funds have been provided through the TED budget to provide supervisor training. The additional funding has also allowed the TED to develop a more systematic data system to make informed decisions on what specific areas need to be address in the professional development trainings and opportunities.

The table below identifies the number of NHU full-time and adjunct faculty and the number of credential candidates.

| <b>Full-time Faculty</b> | <b>Adjuncts</b> | <b>Credential Candidates</b> |
|--------------------------|-----------------|------------------------------|
| 4.5                      | 20              | 145                          |

Data-driven supervisor-training sessions were held in July 2010 and February 2011. Supervisor trainings are scheduled each semester resulting in three per year. Master teacher training sessions formally began in fall 2010 and were individually conducted by the practicum and intern coordinator. The coordinator maintains logs of training events. Master teacher trainings are scheduled every six-weeks.

NHU is designing specific training activities for master teachers to improve their role and responsibility as master teachers and their affiliation to NHU. An e-mail newsletter is being distributed every other month to NHU supervisors and master teachers to provide them with current information on NHU events and opportunities.

A survey related to the effectiveness of supervisors and master teachers was created in the summer of 2010 and implemented in fall 2010. Data are now collected on each master teacher and supervisor at the end of the each six-week practicum assignment. Candidate surveys are completed by the candidate, collected and provided to the department chair. The chair disaggregates the data and discusses results with the faculty and coordinators and decisions based on the data are made. The data are used to develop training modules and work on deficiencies, retain supervisors and master teachers, and upgrade syllabi to address deficiencies.

The Vice President of Finance left NHU in the fall of 2010. NHU has been operating with the assistance of shared services since the Vice President of Finance left. Laureate has launched a search to hire a new Vice President of Campus Operations to oversee campus operations and finance. This is a high priority for the university and for Laureate.

Oversight of the Teacher Education departmental budget became the responsibility the department in January 2011. The Provost provides final signature and approval on all department budgets although the department chairs make decisions as to how funds will be used. Development of the 2011 fiscal year budget occurred through several meetings with Laureate shared services and the Provost.

### **2011 Revisit Team Findings**

Three existing staff had their positions increased from part-time to full-time, resulting in far more staff resources devoted to the program. One staff member is now responsible for staff development/TPA support, a second staff is responsible for practicum and intern coordination and the third is the credential analyst/advisor.

The team found that professional development activities have been developed for master teachers and university supervisors. Several trainings have been conducted since the 2010 visit. In addition, individual orientation and trainings have been provided at the master teachers' school sites.

The team found that the oversight of the Teacher Education Department budget became the responsibility of the department in 2011.

The team determined that there is an increase in staff resources and a change of budgetary oversight to the department level. These have resulted in many new professional development activities provided to university supervisors and master teachers. This standard is now **Met**.

#### **2010 Team Findings: Standard 4: Faculty and Instructional Personnel**

##### **Met with Concerns**

The criteria for selection and retention of supervisors are unclear. Interviews with these individuals indicated that they at times had limited knowledge of the program and little guidance as they began their supervisory roles. Also, greater emphasis needs to be given to development activities that will strengthen the skills of the master teachers, the site support providers and the university supervisors.

Evaluations are not completed regularly for university supervisors, master teachers, and site support providers. Systematic assessments of faculty, adjunct instructors, supervisors and master teachers will enable the Unit to provide support to decision making.

#### **2011 Institutional Response**

Supervisors meet well-defined selection criteria and go through a university selection committee, reference check and background check prior to service as a university supervisor. The practicum and intern coordinator provides orientation for the position prior to a supervisor being assigned a site. Continuing supervisors are evaluated each year to identify needs, strengths, and training opportunities. Any supervisor that does not meet expectations, university requirements, or fulfill responsibilities is released or not invited back. This decision is made administratively in collaboration with the practicum and intern coordinator.

During orientation, the practicum and intern coordinator provides an avenue for trouble-shooting should any problems arise. Generally, the supervisor works with the coordinator on any problem. The TED chair is also available to provide assistance if needed.

The newly-hired practicum and supervision coordinator developed a training agenda and now conducts individual training sessions each six-weeks with master teachers. Site support/supervisors go through training each semester. Fall and spring trainings for 2010-2011 are completed. Supervisors are also invited to NHU training opportunities.

Following the 2010 COA report student evaluations of supervisors and master teacher surveys were created and ready to implement with the first practicum in the fall of 2010. Evaluation of supervisor work occurs every six weeks on practicum supervisors and master teachers. The coordinator monitors intern support providers. Evaluation of intern support providers occurs at the end of the year by interns and by the coordinator. The first intern support provider evaluation will be conducted in May 2011.

### **2011 Revisit Team Findings**

The team found that there are clear criteria for selection and retention of supervisors and university support providers. Interviews with supervisors indicated that they are provided more guidance about NHU's teacher education program and their roles in the program. Efforts have been made to clarify and begin to develop the skills that are needed by master teachers, university supervisors and support providers.

Evaluations are now completed regularly for supervisors and master teachers. An evaluation instrument has been developed and will be implemented for university support providers by May 2011.

On the basis of review of documentation and interviews the team has determined that criteria for selection of supervisors are clear. The supervisors, master teachers and support providers are now aware of the skills required for their roles. This standard is now **Met**.

### **2010 Team Findings: Standard 7: Field Experience and Clinical Practice**

#### **Met with Concerns**

Master teachers indicated that the student teaching experience be extended to provide all candidates a more realistic picture of teaching.

Partners give little input into the program. Instead, the schools that are willing to take student teachers receive them. The Master teachers receive little to no training. Master teachers describe their training as a short manual that is provided to them prior to a candidate beginning his/her student teaching. In most cases there is little collaboration between the University and the school sites. Candidates only assess informally their clinical practice, university supervisors and master teachers. There is no formal evaluation that would enable the University to identify ineffective Master teachers and University Supervisors.

Through several interviews, there was some confusion regarding the definitions, roles and availability of intern support providers and university employed supervisors. Team members found that there is insufficient training and development activities as well as evaluation processes for faculty, supervisors, and master teachers.

### **2011 Institutional Response**

Candidates are required to engage in field experiences throughout the program. For classes that might not have a built-in field experience candidates explore and discuss situations in order to understand and address issues of diversity that affect teaching and learning.

The practicum and intern coordinator meets with school district personnel and the site principals to discuss possible sites and master teachers. Once a mutual decision is reached the coordinator establishes a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) that outlines responsibilities and is signed by each intern supervisors. This has increased the amount of input from NHU partners. The coordinator maintains communication with each of the school sites by phone or e-mail in order to continuously evaluate the placement and the candidate's participation. As issues arise, the coordinator discusses them with the chair and the district and works towards a solution.

Collaboration will continue to become better as the coordinator perfects the process and works with advisory committees.

Training now occurs in fall and spring for supervisors. Master teachers are provided information and training at the beginning of each practicum assignment. Student teachers evaluate their master teachers and supervisors after each six-week practicum. This practice began in summer 2010. The coordinator oversees the collection of data and submits it to the chair for discussion. The data are analyzed and shared with the supervisors by the chair and coordinator. Areas that need to be improved are discussed individually by the chair and/or coordinator or discussed during supervisor training. Data collected provide the basis for professional development activities and needs. Interns evaluate through a survey twice a year.

During the fall 2010 semester, data were collected for seven supervisors and 18 master teachers. This information allowed the institution to determine which supervisors and master teachers were working well and fulfilling the supervisory requirements, which areas needed overall improvement as well as what changes needed to be implemented.

### **2011 Revisit Team Findings**

The team found that there has been improvement in the development of partnerships, process for identifying master teachers, the orientation of master teachers to their role and in collaboration between the university and the school sites. Candidates now systematically and formally evaluate their university supervisors and master teachers.

Through document review and several interviews the team found that some confusion still exists regarding the definitions of university supervisors and university support providers. Constituent group representatives understood the role of the supervisor but also tended to refer to support providers as supervisors.

The team is convinced that NHU intern supervisors and university supervisors are clear about their roles. Roles have now been clarified and there is appropriate availability of supervisors and support providers. However, the term “supervisor” is still sometimes used to describe both groups. This standard is now **Met**.

### **2010 Team Findings: Standard 8: District-Employed Supervisors      Met with Concerns**

There seems to be no formal method of identifying qualified master teachers. Master teachers were selected because they had a relationship with NHU or were selected by principals in individual schools that were contacted by the Coordinator of Field Experience.

Supervisors stated they received little or no training in supervision. Supervisors indicate that they were prepared because they were principals or supervisors prior to retirement. University Supervisors and Master teachers indicate they received little training in using the formal assessment. Development opportunities for master teachers should be offered and a systematic plan for selection of qualified master teachers is needed.

### **2011 Institutional Response**

The participating district human resources staff and principals of the schools identify master

teachers. The practicum and intern coordinator works with each district and each of the identified schools to ensure that the master teachers who are identified are the most qualified and the best examples of effective teaching. Master teachers are selected using well-defined criteria that include at least three years of successful full-time teaching, skills dealing with changing student populations, particularly English language learners, and the appropriate and valid credential in the area of supervision.

The practicum and intern coordinator conducts training sessions at the start of each placement. The professional development coordinator in collaboration with the chair conducts supervisor training. Training is during the day and covers areas that are identified from student evaluations and from new requirements or department changes.

NHU supervisors come from a variety of backgrounds such as administration, teaching, coordinators, and principals. They bring a wealth of experience thus opening up the opportunity to expand their knowledge and skills. To provide opportunities to grow in their skill as a supervisor, NHU trainings now include information and practice on CSTPs, evaluation techniques, observation practice, and feedback tips.

Trainings were designed and implemented for master teachers in fall 2010. Training is individual and conducted by the practicum and intern coordinator. The coordinator maintains logs of training events. Supervisor trainings occurred in July 2010 and in February 2011. NHU is designing specific training activities for master teachers to improve on their role and responsibility as master teachers and their affiliation to NHU.

### **2011 Revisit Team Findings**

Through interviews with faculty, master teachers, the NHU practicum and intern coordinator and review of program documents the team has determined that there is a consistent practice and formal method for identification of qualified master teachers. Selection is now done through a process through which the school district is the first contact.

Master teachers now receive an orientation to their roles and responsibilities which includes a meeting with the practicum and intern coordinator and support materials. Information included in the orientation covers how to use the formal assessment of student teachers that master teachers are required to complete at the end of each student teaching experience.

District-employed supervisors receive training in the components of supervision as well as their role as a master teacher. They are regularly evaluated and the results are used to determine retention of master teachers. This standard is now **Met**.

### **Multiple Subject and Single Subject Credential Programs, with Internship and BCLAD Emphasis**

During the 2010 accreditation visit the team found three Multiple Subject and Single Subject Credential Program standards that were met with concerns and six Mild to Moderate Education Specialist Credential Program standards that were met with concerns. Following are excerpts

from the original 2010 team findings on the program standards, excerpts from the 2011 institutional response, the 2011 revisit team findings.

### **2010 Team Findings: Program Standard 1: Program Design** **Met with Concerns**

Due to the small numbers of candidates enrolled in the Single Subject program, methods classes are integrated with Single Subject, Multiple Subject and even, at times, CTEL candidates. Attempts are made to give subject appropriate instruction to all these groups; however interviews with students revealed that there were some inconsistencies.

Through interviews with candidates, program partners, faculty and staff, the team found that the program design does not provide supervision from university supervisors throughout the internship. There is a lack of university supervision during the beginning and middle portions of interns' teaching. University supervision is not provided until the final 12 weeks of their internship, while in the student teaching course.

### **2011 Institutional Response**

The main methods class for single subject candidates is taught by a single subject expert as well as a former secondary teacher. Differentiated instruction and requirements are integrated throughout all the courses thus providing pedagogical experiences appropriate to the credential area. Within these classes, candidates are asked to reflect, design lessons, and engage in field experiences that are specific to their credential area.

To ensure that the single subject candidate needs are met, NHU is working with its instructors to better differentiate assignments to meet the various content and grade levels in the university classes. Syllabi are reviewed and changed as needed to better meet the needs of all levels and credential areas.

To ensure that the candidate consistently engages in critical thinking and is prepared to work with a diverse population, a supervisor is assigned during student teaching or internship. The intern supervisors are asked to make weekly contact or observations, respond to reflections, provide feedback on lessons and read student journals.

Support providers are assigned by the practicum and intern coordinator in early fall or as soon as candidates are issued an internship credential by the Commission. The coordinator ensures that interns are getting regular service and assistance as needed. Inconsistencies will be individually addressed as the year progresses. Monthly logs are collected from each support provider assigned to interns and checked to see that interns are receiving the services and resources. When discrepancies are identified, the coordinator meets with the support provider to discuss the issue and to make changes if necessary. The practicum and intern coordinator will work to correct problems such as lack of observations or providing feedback.

### **2011 Revisit Team Findings**

Through review of documentation and interviews with candidates and faculty the team found that single subject candidates are now taking a single subject methods course that provides content appropriate pedagogy for middle school and high school students.

The institution has addressed the support issue throughout the program by providing university support providers; however, the support does not address the supervision requirement that is identified in this standard.

The team has determined that the new single subject methods class clearly meets the candidates' needs for content-specific instruction. The team has found that the program has substantially increased the support for interns throughout the program. There is no evidence, however, that supervision is provided throughout the program. This standard remains **Met with Concerns**.

### **2010 Team Findings: Program Standard 2: Collaboration in Governing the Program Met with Concerns**

While there is evidence of some collaboration between program providers and districts, their joint collaboration is not systematic as envisioned by this standard.

### **2011 Institutional Response**

NHU has established the Teacher Education Advisory Committee, which provides a forum for the review and exchange of information, suggestions and perspectives on a wide range of issues associated with the preparation of educators; makes recommendations concerning programs that lead to teacher certification; provides data and feedback on the needs of the districts. The Advisory Committee meets twice a year to provide the program with essential community feedback on the program, its operations and its goals. The committee met in August 2010 and will meet again during 2011 to discuss the additional programs, locations of classes, needs, and future goals.

### **2011 Revisit Team Findings**

On the basis of review of program documents and interviews with the newly established Teacher Education Advisory Committee, there is evidence of systematic collaboration between program providers and school districts, higher education partners, and other constituents, and this joint collaboration is systematic and planned as envisioned by this standard. Review of the advisory committee meeting minutes indicates discussion of data and agreements on collaborative initiatives based on identified needs.

This systematic collaboration as verified by the minutes and documents produced by the Teacher Education Advisory Committee will result in program improvement initiatives based on identified needs that will result in improved preparation of credential candidates. The standard is now **Met**.

### **2010 Team Findings: Standard 8-B: Pedagogical Preparation for Subject-Specific Content Instruction by Single Subject (SS) Candidates Met with Concerns**

Interviews with Single Subject candidates indicated that there were some problems in the methods classes as they were integrated with Multiple Subject candidates. All candidates receive the same instruction on the use of a specific teaching strategy. They then break out into small groups and attempt to develop ways that they could apply that method to their disciplines. Therefore, candidates do not receive pedagogical preparation for subject specific content instruction.

### **2011 Institutional Response**

With the exception of the methods course specifically designed to meet the subject and content area needs of secondary students, the secondary students receive differentiated instruction and experiences throughout their other coursework. The TED and NHU have also added three new instructors and supervisors who have secondary experiences to ensure that NHU provides better coverage and address candidates' concerns.

The critical methods class, Secondary Methods, only has single subject candidates enrolled so they receive specific pedagogical instruction that not only pertains to secondary methods but also addresses specific content areas. The instructor has secondary experience and is a curriculum and instruction expert.

Students meet in content area groups to discuss strategies, standards, and management issues that are specific to the content areas. Each content group and individual student is required to demonstrate understanding through lesson plans and through successful passing of the Pedagogy TPA. Students are also required to meet with subject matter teachers and experts in the field to gain a better understanding of secondary methodology.

The Reading Language Arts class has revised the course assignments to include differentiated assignments in order to look at how concepts are addressed across the grade levels (implemented Spring Semester 2011). For example when discussing vocabulary, students look at strategies that are appropriate for each of the grade levels and for the content areas in the class. These strategies are incorporated into lesson plans that are grade level appropriate. Students also meet in grade level groups and in content areas as well. The goal is to be able to address reading and writing task no matter the reading levels of students.

Secondary students are also asked to interview and observe subject area experts in both the Secondary Methods and in Reading and Language Arts courses. Following these experiences, students reflect on the implications for classroom pedagogy and for their own classroom.

### **2011 Revisit Team Findings**

Through review of documentation and interviews with candidates and faculty the team found that single subject candidates are now taking a single subject methods course that provides content appropriate pedagogy for middle school and high school students. Interviews with Single Subject Credential candidates verify student satisfaction with their pedagogical preparation for content specific instruction.

Single Subject credential candidates are now receiving instruction in appropriate methods for content specific instruction. The standard is now **Met**.

### **Level I Mild to Moderate Education Specialist Credential Program, with Internship**

#### **2010 Team Findings: Standard 11: Educational Policy and Perspectives**

##### **Met with Concerns**

While most Education Specialist candidates appear to complete the foundations course early in their program, it appears that it is not uncommon for interns to begin their internship in their own classrooms before they have completed the foundations course taken by all candidates and the introductory special education course. The sequence of coursework places general education courses before special education coursework. Therefore, the program does not consistently provide initial instruction in the essential themes, concepts, and skills related to the duties of a special educator prior to assuming their intern positions. At the same time, due to the small size of the program, some courses may be offered on an infrequent basis, such as once a year, so it may not be possible for candidates to follow the sequence as planned.

#### **2011 Institutional Response**

Education specialist candidates are required to complete one of two foundation courses as a part of their credential coursework: Foundations of Education, or Teaching Mild to Moderate Students, before they enter their internship. Although a small program does not always allow for cohorts or multiple offerings, NHU interns are required to engage in courses that provide the tools and information needed for an internship as a part of their 120 hours prior to internship. The 120 hours include Field Experience, which requires interviews with a teacher who works with mild/moderate students and the inclusive classroom.

Additionally, interns are required to take one of the following to fulfill their 120 hours leading to an understanding and experience with the tools and information needed for an internship: SPED 502: Curriculum and Instruction Adaptations; SPED 500: Assessment and Instructional Planning; SPED 508: Behavior Management and Interventions; EDU 508. Educational Foundations.

Although the program pathway lists general education courses before the special education coursework, students are encouraged through advising sessions to enroll in the special education courses as soon as they are available on the schedule. Students are not required to take the courses listed on the pathway in sequence. The pathway only serves as a blueprint.

The course syllabi were reviewed and changes made to ensure that the essential themes, concepts and skills related to the duties of a special educator are discussed in the four SPED courses (offered 1-2 times a year), EDU 551: Inclusive Educational Practices (offered once each semester), and EDU 516: Field Experience course (offered each semester).

All special education interns will be required to include the course Inclusive Education Practices and Field Experience in the 120 hours thus ensuring that the themes, concepts and skills are covered. Special Education interns also complete at least 1-2 SPED courses prior to becoming an intern as at least one course is offered every fall semester when interns generally are hired.

While it is difficult for students to follow the special education pathway in sequence, the department is endeavoring to produce course schedules for the year thus providing students the opportunity to plan their schedules in a more sequential way. As the program grows, the course may be offered more than once per year.

### **2011 Revisit Team Findings**

A review of documentation and interviews with faculty, program administration, and advisors have provided evidence that Education Specialist interns are now required to complete coursework in the essential themes, concepts, and skills related to the duties of a special educator before the candidate assumes intern responsibilities. Course content in the four special education courses and two other courses have been revised to include content in these essential themes, concepts, and skills. These courses do not have to be taken in a specific sequence, and are offered with enough frequency to ensure that interns can fulfill the 120 hours requirement for coursework prior to assuming their intern responsibilities.

The team has determined that changes have been made to the availability of courses, the course content, and candidate advisement so that interns can fulfill the coursework that is required prior to assuming their intern responsibilities. The standard is now **Met**.

### **2010 Team Findings: Program Standard 13: Special Education Field Experiences with Diverse Populations Met with Concerns**

In the Intern program, there is a lack of university supervision during the beginning and middle portions of interns' teaching. University supervision is not provided until the final 12 weeks of their internship, while in the student teaching course.

### **2011 Institutional Response**

As of August 2010 all interns are assigned a supervisor in fall of each school year or at the beginning of the internship. Continuing interns are reassigned the same supervisor until the credential is issued if no problems occur with the assignment.

Supervisors assist candidates with lesson planning, classroom management, resources, parent issues, and navigating school policies. A Memorandum of Understanding outlines required responsibilities and is signed by each of the supervisors who work specifically with interns. This MOU is created, reviewed, and monitored by the practicum and intern coordinator. The chair signs off on the MOU as well as the supervisor.

The practicum and intern coordinator oversees the university supervisor activities. One of the coordinator's responsibilities is to meet with the supervisors and to collect monthly logs. This ensures that supervisors are providing support and working with the interns weekly.

### **2011 Revisit Team Findings**

Based on reviews of documentation and interviews with program administration, intern supervisors, university support providers, current interns and recent graduates, the team has found that there has been a change to the program in which interns are now assigned a university support provider (or in a small number of cases, a district-employed support provider) when they enter the intern program. This university support provider provides non-evaluative support in teaching, planning, and other aspects of the intern's responsibilities. This person will also support the intern after they have finished the "student teaching" courses. However, the university support provider is not providing supervision and evaluation. This only occurs when interns are in the two 6-week "student teaching" courses, when a university supervisor works with them.

The team has determined that although interns receive support during their entire intern program interns are supervised while in the two "student teaching" courses only. The standard remains **Met with Concerns**.

### **2010 Team Findings: Program Standard 14: Qualifications and Responsibilities of Supervisors and Selection of Field Site Met with Concerns**

There is not a process to evaluate university supervisors. Interns do not receive supervision throughout their internship.

### **2011 Institutional Response**

Several steps were taken following the COA report including establishment of an Assessment Committee to provide feedback, creation of a survey to evaluate supervisors and master teachers, surveys for supervisors and master teachers were collected, analyzed and corrective actions planned, training sessions covering concerns identified in the survey were conducted. An intern supervisor survey was also created. It is anticipated that data will be collected during the month of May 2011.

Following the six-week practicum (regular and intern) students complete a survey at the end of the assigned six-week placement. This survey measures strengths and expectations of each supervisor and master teacher. The university has completed 3 collections.

The TED chair reviews the data with the assistance of the department instructors and coordinators. The Teacher Education Assessment Committee assists with the analysis and makes suggestions for changes if needed.

Discussion on supervisor responsibilities including feedback on lesson plans and portfolio consultation will be included when the next Memorandum of Understanding is signed. In addition, individual results will be discussed with each supervisor and the supervisor will be asked to do a reflection on how to improve the service he or she provides to the candidate. The reflection is to be given to the practicum and intern coordinator to be shared with the chair.

As of fall 2010 all interns are assigned a supervisor that will remain with them throughout the internship. The supervisor is assigned after the Commission on Teacher Credentialing issues the credential to the intern.

### **2011 Revisit Team Findings**

Based on reviews of documentation and interviews, the team has determined that a process for evaluating university supervisors has been developed and implemented. Results of the evaluations have been used to create professional development activities for supervisors.

The findings regarding the issue of intern supervision has been addressed in Standard 13.

Although the term “supervisor” is often used in reference to the individuals who are assigned to interns to provide support throughout their program, they are in role and responsibilities actually support providers, not supervisors. There is still insufficient evidence that candidates are being supervised throughout the program. The standard remains ***Met with Concerns***.

### **2010 Team Findings: Program Standard 17: Assessment, Curriculum, and Instruction Met with Concerns**

The development of skills and knowledge in the use of assistive technology with students with mild/moderate disabilities is insufficient. Review of documents and information obtained from interviews indicated that while there is an assignment concerning technology in at least one course, the use of assistive technology with students with mild/moderate disabilities does not appear to be infused or developed throughout the program.

### **2011 Institutional Response**

The NHU chair worked with one of the special education faculty members and a subject matter expert who also an NHU course instructor to review syllabi and coursework to identify the areas that needed to be clarified or added. After this initial review several changes were made to address the concerns. The use of assistive technology has been directly addressed throughout the program and coursework.

### **2011 Revisit Team Findings**

The team has determined from interviews and reviews of syllabi that course syllabi in all of the special education courses have been changed to incorporate the development of skills and knowledge in the use of assistive technology. The NHU Education Specialist program is currently in transition and NHU will have to write to the new preliminary Education Specialist standards, which includes additional content related to the use of assistive technology.

Content regarding the use of assistive technology with students with mild/moderate disabilities is now being included in readings, instruction, and assignments in several courses. The standard is now **Met**.

**Program Standard 22: Assessment and Evaluation of Students****Met with Concerns**

Knowledge and skills in the areas of life skills and transition assessment are not sufficiently developed nor required to be demonstrated.

**2011 Institutional Response**

After thorough analysis and review of the course syllabi and requirements as well as student feedback, life skills and transition assessment content were included in two special education courses to better meet the standard expectations and to address the concerns raised by the accreditation team: SPED 500, Teaching Mild to Moderate Students Transition and Life Skills and SPED 502, Curriculum and Instruction Adaptations Life Skills.

**2011 Revisit Team Findings**

The team has determined from interviews and reviews of syllabi that course syllabi in two of the special education courses have been changed to incorporate skills and knowledge concerning life skills development and transition assessment. The NHU Education Specialist program is currently in transition and NHU will have to write to the new preliminary Education Specialist standards, which includes additional content related to the development of life skills and transition assessment.

Content regarding life skills development and transition assessment with students with mild/moderate disabilities is now being included in readings, instruction, and assignments in two courses. The standard is now **Met**.

**2010 Team Findings: Program Standard 25: Characteristics of Individuals with Mild to Moderate Disabilities****Met with Concerns**

Candidates do not obtain sufficient knowledge in the characteristics of students with specific disabilities within the area of mild/moderate disabilities. A review of syllabi and interview input from program completers indicate that strategies, interventions, and curricula that have research-based effectiveness with students who have different mild/moderate disabilities are not sufficiently addressed. Examples were given by program completers of not having sufficient knowledge of specific learning needs and effective intervention with students with different mild/moderate disabilities.

**2011 Institutional Response**

The NHU TED faculty and chair reviewed syllabi and Educational Specialist standards for clarification and for areas to revise. Informal conversations with students also provided information. Changes that were needed to meet the standard and address the COA concerns are included in three special education courses: SPED 503, Teaching Mild to Moderate Students: Types of Disabilities, SPED 501, Assistive Technology for Students With Behavior Problems, SPED 502, Curriculum and Instruction Adaptations Curriculum Areas.

NHU instructors and the TED chair analyzed the four special education courses for the purpose of adapting, revising, or creating assignments that addressed the learning needs and interventions

for mild to moderate students. Examples of adaptations or changes of assignments that address learning needs and interventions are included in the courses.

### **2011 Revisit Team Findings**

The team has determined from interviews and reviews of syllabi that course syllabi in several of the special education courses have been changed to incorporate knowledge and skills in designing instruction that meets specific needs of students with mild/moderate disabilities.

Content regarding differentiating instruction for the specific needs of students with mild/moderate disabilities is now being included in readings, instruction, and assignments in special education courses. The standard is now **Met**.